the replacement of HOMALOPTERIDAE will actually threaten stability? He failed to mention that almost no one besides these few authors has been working on 'homalopterids' (sensu prior) and that other uses occur only in a few lists and bibliographies. Noteworthy also is the fact that besides basic systematic literature, there are only two publications dealing with aspects of the biology of these fishes. On the other hand, nowhere has the petitioner mentioned the degree of acceptance and usage of the name BALITORIDAE since its re-introduction in July 1988. It seems that an objective presentation of the case requires that the use of both BALITORIDAE and HOMALOPTERIDAE be summarized. This would show that BALITORIDAE has been adopted almost immediately and that, besides the petitioner's, no comment against its use has been published in the ichthyological literature. On the contrary, it has been widely accepted. A list (held by the Commission Secretariat) of 21 references of papers, books and works demonstrates use of BALITORIDAE instead of HOMALOPTERIDAE since July 1988, and also that the name change has been immediately followed in South and Southeast Asia where most of the fishes occur. It is noteworthy that BALITORIDAE is the name used in the Newsletter of Systematic Ichthyology and in Eschmeyer's (1990, p. 447) *Genera of Recent Fishes*, which is without doubt a milestone publication on fish nomenclature this century. Adoption of names other than those used in such a reference work will certainly create confusion. The name BALITORIDAE has also entered usage in conservation biology and appears in the IUCN's (1990) *Red List*.

I therefore request that the Commission reject Hieronimus's application.

Additional references

Eschmeyer, W.N. 1990. *Catalog of the genera of recent fishes*. 697 pp. California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco.

IUCN. 1990. *1990 IUCN Red List of threatened animals*. 192 pp. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.

(2) J.S. Nelson

Department of Zoology, Faculty of Science, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada, T6G 2E9

I accepted, although reluctantly, the use of the family-group name BALITORIDAE Swainson, 1839 rather than HOMALOPTERIDAE Bleeker, 1859. I agree with the views of Kottelat (above) and think it would be a step backwards to bring back HOMALOPTERIDAE. It is sometimes difficult to decide between stability, priority, common sense, justice to authors, and other factors. However, I feel that the interests of zoological nomenclature would be best served by now staying with BALITORIDAE.

Comment on the proposed precedence of ICHTHYOPHIIDAE Taylor, 1968 (Amphibia, Gymnophiona) over EPICRIIDAE Fitzinger, 1843

(Case 2616 and Opinion 1604; see BZN **45**: 207–209, **46**: 134, **47**: 166–167 and **48**: 152–155)

Hobart M. Smith

122 Ramaley, Campus Box 334, Boulder, Colorado 80309–0334, U.S.A.

I strongly support the conservation of the name ICHTHYOPHIIDAE (perhaps more correctly ICHTHYOPHEIDAE) Taylor, 1968 since it has been widely adopted and no other

family name has been used in its place this century. I endorse all four of the new proposals on BZN **48**: 155, although EPICRIIDAE Fitzinger, 1843 is highly unlikely to be needed at the family level.

I have previously suggested (1987; *Bulletin of the Maryland Herpetological Society*, **23**: 128–129) that, since the genitive of *ophis* is *opheos* in classical Attic (i.e. Athenian) Greek (although *ophios* in other forms of ancient Greek), the proper spelling of family names based on generic names ending in *-ophis* should be -OPHEIDAE. There are many such names, usually spelled -OPHIIDAE. Perhaps there is a need for a ruling on this.